

EARLY UNIVERSE COSMOLOGY AND SUPERGRAVITY

ANUPAM MAZUMDAR

McGill University, 3600 University Road, Montreal, Canada H3A 2T8

In this talk I will describe the role of supersymmetric flat directions in the early Universe cosmology. Particularly I will discuss how supergravity effects lift the flat direction potential and leads to interesting cosmological consequences.

1 Supergravity & cosmology

Like particle physics cosmology also confronts hierarchical scales; e.g. Planck scale $M_p = 2.436 \times 10^{18}$ GeV, and big bang nucleosynthesis scale $T_{BBN} \sim 1$ MeV, and uncertainties. Unfortunately there is no direct evidence of thermal history of the Universe beyond $T \sim 1$ MeV. Though there are indirect evidences which when tied up with particle physics makes a strong case that thermal history could go way beyond the nucleosynthesis scale to the grand unification scale $T \leq \alpha^2 M_p \sim 10^{16}$ GeV, where $\alpha \sim 10^{-2}$ is the gauge coupling constant. Note that beyond the grand unification scale it might be hard to keep the Universe in a thermal equilibrium due to lack of understanding of interactions and strong dynamics which could prevail. In this respect supergravity (SUGRA) ¹ plays an important role in constraining thermal history of the early Universe, see ².

The superpartner of graviton is a spin 3/2 gravitino with helicity states $\pm 3/2$, $\pm 1/2$. The latter one is mainly the goldstino mode which is eaten by the super-Higgs mechanism ³ when supersymmetry is spontaneously broken. Typically $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetry (SUSY) is broken in a hidden sector by some non-perturbative dynamics, e.g. gaugino condensation ¹. SUSY breaking is then mediated via gravitational (or possibly other) couplings to the observable sector in such a way that sfermions and gauginos get masses of order electroweak scale ^{4,1}. In addition, the gravitino also gets a mass, which in the simplest gravity mediated models is of order $\mathcal{O}(100)$ GeV.

Although gravitino interactions with matter are suppressed by the Planck mass, they can be generated in great abundances very close to the Planck scale ⁵. Inflation would dilute their number density, but during reheating they would be regenerated through scattering of gauge and gaugino quanta, with adverse consequences ⁶. Thermal regeneration of gravitino abundance is harmless for BBN (gravitino decay products can enhance the abundance of $D + {}^3\text{He}$ due to photo fission of ${}^4\text{He}$), provided the reheat temperature of the Universe is $T_{rh} \leq (10^7 - 10^{10})$ GeV, for a range of gravitino mass $100 \text{ GeV} \leq m_{3/2} \leq 10 \text{ TeV}$ ^{7,8}. Gravitinos could also be produced by non-perturbative processes during inflaton oscillations ⁹. Note that expanding Universe breaks supersymmetry and normally the scale is set by the Hubble expansion, which

could be larger than the hidden sector supersymmetry breaking.

It is this early Universe supersymmetry breaking scale plays interesting role. SUGRA plays a very important role in higher dimensions motivated by superstring theory. In this respect cosmological evolution of dilaton and moduli is an important issue which has to be dealt separately. However recently dynamics of dilaton and moduli has been addressed in presence of Ramond Ramond fluxes ¹⁰. Inflationary scenarios ¹¹ have also been proposed where $\mathcal{N} = 1$, 11 dimensional SUGRA model is squashed on a seven sphere. The resulting potentials turn out to be some combination of multi-field exponential potentials of type $c_1 \exp \sum \alpha_i \phi_i + c_2 \exp \sum \beta_i \psi_i + \dots$

In this talk we will not concentrate on finding inflationary solutions, but we will describe the dynamics of the flat directions within minimal supersymmetric standard model (MSSM). Flat directions is a property of any SUSY theory and here we will argue how interesting cosmology arises when we take into account of SUGRA effects.

2 Status of outstanding issues in cosmology

Before we discuss flat directions let us give a brief overview of the present status of cosmological issues. The recent W-MAP data has provided the precision measurement of cosmological parameters, e.g. Hubble expansion, fluctuations in the temperature, perturbation spectrum and its slope, running spectral index, etc ¹², all suggest that perhaps an era of inflation might have occurred. Despite these observational successes, inflaton sector is still eluding. There are many plausible models which can provide more or less correct features but none of them are well motivated from particle physics. The main reason is that inflaton is always treated as a SM gauge singlet. This leads to a wild speculation of inflaton coupling to the SM fields and the scale of inflation ranging from $10^{13} \leq H \leq 10^3$ GeV. Extremely low scale inflation model is possible to construct if the string scale is as low as TeV, e.g., ¹³, for a TeV scale inflation number of e-foldings required for galaxy formation is as low as 43.

Baryogenesis is an indirect evidence of cosmology and particle physics beyond the Higgs scale, because baryon asymmetry of order one part in 10^{10} is sought for the synthesis of light elements at $T \sim 1$ MeV. Within SM it is possible to satisfy all three criteria for baryogenesis, e.g. baryon number violating processes (due to accidental $B + L$ violation arising from the SM sphalerons), C and CP violation, and out of equilibrium condition. In spite of all the necessary ingredients within SM baryogenesis is ruled out because there is not enough strong first order phase transition (success of baryogenesis requires Higgs mass to be $m_H \leq 72$ GeV ¹⁴, which is already ruled out by the LEP data, see ¹⁵). Within MSSM there is a slim hope because the parameter space for Higgs is $110 \text{ GeV} \leq m_H \leq 115 \text{ GeV}$, and the lightest stop to be

lighter than the top quark mass $105 \text{ GeV} \leq m_{\tilde{t}_R} \leq 165 \text{ GeV}$ ¹⁶.

There are other baryogenesis schemes such as thermal leptogenesis in models where right handed neutrino mass appears naturally ¹⁷, or non-thermal leptogenesis ¹⁸. However thermal leptogenesis within $SO(10)$ requires generally large reheat temperature $T_{rh} \geq 10^{10}$, which is generically considered to be tight given the gravitino overproduction constraints. One might resort for non-thermal leptogenesis scenarios, but unfortunately they bear the uncertainties of reheat temperature of the Universe. Though they could be tested from CMB experiments ¹⁹. In this respect MSSM flat directions can act as a savior ^{21,22}, because a generic flat direction carries global $U(1)$ baryon and/or lepton number which can be broken due to soft A-terms, which we will discuss briefly, for details see ².

Other important issues are the cold dark matter generation which comprise 30% of the total energy density, and the cosmological constant which has the largest share of 70% at the present moment. The cold dark matter is well served by supersymmetric candidate neutralino (We have had many talks on this issue in this conference, see ²⁰). The cosmological constant is a real issue for which we have NO understanding. The major problem is why the cosmological constant is so small, and why it is dominating now. There are some resolution of the smallness and why now for cosmological constant in terms of non-perturbative θ -vacuum, see ²³.

3 A brief review of MSSM flat directions

At the level of renormalizable terms, SUSY field theories generically have infinitely degenerate vacua. This is a consequence of SUSY and gauge symmetries (and discrete symmetries such as R -parity) of the Lagrangian. Therefore, in general there are a number of directions in the space of scalar fields, collectively called the moduli space, where the scalar potential is identically zero. In low energy SUSY theories such classical degeneracy is accidental and is protected from perturbative quantum corrections by a non-renormalization theorem ²⁴. In principle the degeneracies could be lifted by non-perturbative effects. However such effects are likely to be suppressed exponentially and thus unimportant because all the couplings of low energy theories are typically weak even at relatively large vevs. Therefore in a SUSY limit when $M_p \rightarrow \infty$, the potential for the flat direction always vanishes.

However there is an effective potential for the flat direction arises as a result of SUSY breaking terms and higher dimensional operators in the superpotential. In this sense MSSM flat directions are only approximately flat at vevs larger than the SUSY breaking scale.

The SUSY scalar potential V is the sum of the F- and D-terms and reads

$$V = \sum_i |F_i|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_a g_a^2 D^a D^a, \quad F_i \equiv \frac{\partial W_{MSSM}}{\partial \phi_i}, \quad D^a = \phi^i \dagger T^a \phi_i. \quad (1)$$

Here we have assumed that ϕ_i transforms under a gauge group G with the generators of the Lie algebra given by T^a .

An example of a D-and F-flat direction is provided by LH_u .

$$H_u = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \phi \end{pmatrix}, \quad L = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} \phi \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (2)$$

We can denote ϕ as a complex field parameterizing the flat direction, or the order parameter, or the AD field. All the other fields are set to zero. In terms of the composite gauge invariant operators, we would write $X_m = LH_u$ ($m = 2$).

From Eq. 2 one clearly obtains $F_{H_u}^* = \lambda_u Q \bar{u} + \mu H_d = F_L^* = \lambda_d H_d \bar{e} \equiv 0$ for all ϕ . However there exists a non-zero F-component given by $F_{H_d}^* = \mu H_u$. Since μ can not be much larger than the electroweak scale $M_W \sim \mathcal{O}(1)$ TeV, this contribution is of the same order as the soft supersymmetry breaking masses, which are going to lift the degeneracy. Therefore, following ²², one may nevertheless consider LH_u to correspond to a F-flat direction.

The relevant D-terms read $D_{SU(2)}^a = H_u^\dagger \tau_3 H_u + L^\dagger \tau_3 L = \frac{1}{2}|\phi|^2 - \frac{1}{2}|\phi|^2 \equiv 0$. Therefore LH_u direction is also D-flat. All the MSSM flat directions are listed in ²⁵ following ²⁶.

4 Lifting flat directions

Vacuum degeneracy along a flat direction can be broken in two ways: by supersymmetry breaking, or by higher order non-renormalizable operators appearing in the effective low energy theory.

A particular class of non-renormalizable interaction terms induced by the inflaton arise for a Kähler potential which has a form ^{27,22,28}, and which generates terms like

$$K = \int d^4\theta \frac{1}{M_P^2} (I^\dagger I) (\phi^\dagger \phi), \quad \mathcal{L} = \frac{\rho_I}{M_P^2} \phi^\dagger \phi = 3H_I^2 \phi^\dagger \phi, \quad (3)$$

where I is the inflaton whose energy density $\rho \approx \langle \int d^4\theta I^\dagger I \rangle$ dominates during inflation, and ϕ is the flat direction. In the above H_I is the Hubble parameter during inflation. In addition, there are also inflaton-induced supergravity corrections to the flat direction. By inspecting $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supergravity potential, one finds the following terms like

$$V(\phi) = H^2 M_P^2 f\left(\frac{\phi}{M_P}\right), \quad m_\phi^2 = \left(2 + \frac{F_I^* F_I}{V_F(I) + V_D(I)}\right) H^2. \quad (4)$$

where f is some function, and the effective mass for inflaton is written for a minimal choice of flat direction Kähler potential $K(\phi^\dagger, \phi) = \phi^\dagger \phi$.

In purely D-term inflation ²⁹ there is no Hubble induced mass correction to the flat direction during inflation because $F_I = 0$. However, when D-term inflation ends, the energy density stored in the D-term is converted to an

F-term and to kinetic energy of the inflaton. Thus again a mass term $m_\phi^2 = \pm \mathcal{O}(1)H^2$ appears naturally, however the overall sign is undetermined³⁰. For non-flat Kähler potential such as in no-scale models $K \sim \ln(z + z^* + \phi_i^\dagger \phi)$, where z belongs to supersymmetry breaking sector, and ϕ_i belongs to the matter sector, and both are measured in terms of reduced Planck mass (for a review, see³¹ the mass term for the flat direction in presence of inflationary potential turns out to be $m_\phi^2 \sim 10^{-2}H_I^2$ ^{27,32}.

Besides supergravity correction the flat directions can be lifted by the non-renormalizable contributions such as²²

$$W = \frac{h}{dM^{d-3}}\phi^d, \quad W = \frac{h}{M^{d-3}}\psi\phi^{d-1}, \quad \text{and} \quad V(\phi) = \frac{|\lambda|^2}{M^{2d-6}}(\phi^*\phi)^{d-1}. \quad (5)$$

where the dimensionality of the effective scalar operator is d , and h is a coupling constant which could be complex with $|h| \sim \mathcal{O}(1)$. Here M is some large mass, typically of the order of the Planck mass or the string scale (in the heterotic case $M \sim M_{GUT}$).

Vacuum degeneracy will also be lifted by supersymmetry breaking. It is induced by the soft terms, which in the simplest case read

$$V(\phi) = m_0^2|\phi|^2 + \left[\frac{\lambda A \phi^d}{dM^{d-3}} + \text{h.c.} \right], \quad (6)$$

where SUSY breaking mass m_0 and A are typically of the order of the gravitino mass $m_{3/2}$. An additional soft source for SUSY breaking are the gaugino masses m_g . The A -term in Eq. (6) violates the $U(1)$ carried by the flat direction and thus provides the necessary source for $B - L$ violation in AD baryogenesis. In general, the coupling λ is complex and has an associated phase θ_λ . Writing $\phi = |\phi| \exp(i\theta)$, one obtains a potential proportional to $\cos(\theta_\lambda + n\theta)$ in the angular direction. This has n discrete minima for the phase of ϕ , at each of which $U(1)$ is broken.

5 The potential for flat direction

5.1 F-term inflation

Let us collect all the terms which contribute to the flat direction potential, which in the case of F-term inflation can be written as²²

$$V(\phi) = -C_I H_I^2 |\phi|^2 + \left(a \lambda_d H \frac{\phi^d}{dM^{d-3}} + \text{h.c.} \right) + m_\phi^2 |\phi|^2 + \left(A_\phi \lambda_d \frac{\phi^d}{dM^{d-3}} + \text{h.c.} \right) + |\lambda|^2 \frac{|\phi|^{2d-2}}{M^{2d-6}}. \quad (7)$$

The first and the third terms are the Hubble-induced and low-energy soft mass terms, respectively, while the second and the fourth terms are the Hubble-induced and low-energy A terms. The last term is the contribution from the

non-renormalizable superpotential. The coefficients $|C_I|$, a , $\lambda_d \sim \mathcal{O}(1)$, and the coupling $\lambda \approx 1/(d-1)!$. Note that low-energy A_ϕ term is dimensionful.

Note here the importance of the relative sign of the coefficient C_I . At large field values the first term dictates the dynamics of the AD field. If $C_I < 0$, the absolute minimum of the potential is $\phi = 0$ and during inflation the AD field will settle down to the bottom of the potential roughly in one Hubble time. In such a case the AD field will not have any interesting classical dynamics. Its presence will nevertheless be felt because of quantum fluctuations. These will be chi-squared in nature since then the classical energy density of the AD field would be due to its own fluctuations.

If $C_I \ll 1$, the AD field takes some time to reach the bottom of the potential, and if it has a non-zero amplitude after the end of inflation, its dynamics is non-trivial.

The most interesting scenario occurs when $C_I > 0$. In this case the absolute value of the AD field settles during inflation to the minimum given by

$$|\phi| \simeq \left(\frac{C_I}{(d-1)\lambda_d} H_I M^{d-3} \right)^{1/d-2}. \quad (8)$$

Here we have ignored the potential term $\propto a$; if $C_I > 0$, the a -term will not change the vev qualitatively. On the other hand, even for $C_I < 0$ the potential Eq. (7) will have a minimum with a non vanishing vev if $|a|^2 > 4(d-1)C_I$. However the origin will also be a minimum in this case. The dynamics then depends on which minimum the AD field will choose during inflation.

The a -term in Eq. (7) violates the global $U(1)$ symmetry carried by ϕ . If $|a|$ is $\mathcal{O}(1)$, the phase θ of $\langle \phi \rangle$ is related to the phase of a through $n\theta + \theta_a = \pi$; otherwise θ will take some random value, which will generally be of $\mathcal{O}(1)$. This is the initial CP -violation which is required for baryogenesis/leptogenesis. In practice, the superpotential term lifting the flat direction is also the B and CP violating operator responsible for AD baryogenesis, inducing a baryon asymmetry in the coherently oscillating ϕ condensate.

5.2 D-term inflation

In D-term inflation one does not get the Hubble induced mass correction to the flat direction so that $C_I = 0$. Also the Hubble induced a -term is absent. However the Hubble induced mass correction eventually dominates once D-term induced inflation comes to an end. The potential for a generic flat direction during D-term inflation is given by

$$V(\phi) = m_\phi^2 |\phi|^2 + \left(A_\phi \lambda_d \frac{\phi^d}{dM^{d-3}} + \text{h.c.} \right) + |\lambda|^2 \frac{|\phi|^{2d-2}}{M^{2d-6}}, \quad (9)$$

and after the end of inflation the flat direction potential is given by ³⁰

$$V(\phi) = (m_\phi^2 - CH^2) |\phi|^2 + \left(A_\phi \lambda_d \frac{\phi^d}{d M^{d-3}} + \text{h.c.} \right) + |\lambda|^2 \frac{|\phi|^{2d-2}}{M^{2d-6}}, \quad (10)$$

where $C \sim \mathcal{O}(1)$. For C positive, the flat direction settles down to one of its minima given by Eq. (8) provided $\phi \geq \sqrt{m_\phi M/\lambda}$, otherwise

$$|\phi| \simeq \left(\frac{2C}{\lambda_d A_\lambda (d-1)} H(t)^2 M^{d-3} \right)^{1/d-2}, \quad (11)$$

Note that in this case that the A -term is also responsible for B and/or L , and CP violation. Another generic point to remember is that in R -parity conserving models the B and/or L violating operators must have even dimensions, so that $d = 4$ yields the minimal operator for AD baryogenesis.

6 Various applications of MSSM flat directions in cosmology

Here we briefly recall important application of MSSM flat directions in the early Universe, and then in the subsequent subsection we will concentrate on how MSSM flat directions can generate observed density fluctuations in the Universe.

(1) Can MSSM flat directions lead to inflation ?

At sufficiently large vevs the non-renormalizable potential $\lambda^2 |\phi|^{2d-2}/M^{2d-6}$ dominates over all the contributions, provided there is Hubble induced correction. Nevertheless the vev of the flat direction never exceeds M_p required for a successful inflation in this case. However one might expect assisted inflation ¹¹ with the help of 300 flat directions within MSSM. Though the yield of number of e-foldings is much less than 55, required to make the Universe flat and homogeneous.

(2) Can MSSM flat direction gives rise to density perturbations ?

For D -term inflation MSSM flat directions evolve in the non-renormalizable potential and feel the quantum fluctuations $\delta\phi \sim H_I/2\pi$, This is a good news because now we may be able to generate the observed density perturbations from the MSSM flat direction, instead from the inflaton sector whose potential we may never be able to construct with full confidence. Besides the MSSM flat direction potential is more constrained than some unknown inflaton sectors ³³.

(3) Can MSSM flat direction gives rise to baryogenesis ?

Yes, the flat direction carries global $U(1)$ charge. For LH_u it is $B - L$. Note that global $U(1)$ is broken only by the A -terms. This provides an ideal condition for CP violation (dynamically), which leads to helical motion on the field space. As a flat direction rotates, it generates the asymmetry. The final leptonic asymmetry is created when LH_u direction completely evaporates. One must take into account of thermal corrections: $\propto T^2 |\phi|^2$ and $T^4 \ln(|\phi|^2/M^2)$. One can further make connection with the light neutrino masses and leptogenesis from the sliding vev of LH_u flat direction. It turns out that the lightest

left handed neutrino mass to be very small around 10^{-8} eV ³⁴. Recent analysis shows that it is possible to obtain the right baryon asymmetry of order one part in 10^{10} .

(4) *Do MSSM flat directions run ?*

One has to consider the running of the soft terms for the MSSM flat directions, e.g. $m_\phi^2|\phi|^2$ term. Running of the MSSM flat direction during inflation has been considered in Ref. ³⁵. It was concluded that LH_u flat direction is a likely candidate whose mass² running remain positive during inflation irrespective of the sign of C_I . Post-inflationary running can give rise to interesting effects depending on low energy supersymmetry breaking schemes, e.g. gravity, or gauge mediation. The potentials for both gravity and gauge mediation can be written, respectively as ^{36,37,38}

$$U(\Phi) = m_\phi^2 \left(1 + K \log \left(\frac{|\Phi|^2}{M^2} \right) \right) |\Phi|^2 + \frac{\lambda^2 |\Phi|^{2(d-1)}}{M_P^{2(d-3)}} + \left(\frac{A_\lambda \lambda \Phi^d}{d M_P^{d-3}} + h.c. \right)$$

$$U(\Phi) = m_\phi^4 \log \left(1 + \frac{|\Phi|^2}{m_\phi^2} \right) + \frac{\lambda^2 |\Phi|^{2(d-1)}}{M_P^{2(d-3)}} + \left(\frac{A_\lambda \lambda \Phi^d}{d M_P^{d-3}} + h.c. \right). \quad (12)$$

where $m_\phi \approx 100$ GeV for gravity mediated SUSY breaking, while $m_\phi \sim 1-100$ TeV in the case of gauge mediation. K is a parameter which depends on the flat direction, and the logarithmic contribution parameterizes the running of the flat direction potential with $M = (M_P^{d-3} m_{3/2} / |\lambda|)^{(1/d-2)}$. In the gravity mediated case $|A_\lambda| < d m_{3/2}$, for gauge mediation $|A_\lambda| \leq (10^{-4} - 10^{-7}) m_\phi$, for $d = 4, 6$ ³⁹. For the squark directions the value of K tends to become negative and this has interesting consequences ⁴⁰.

(5) *What is the fate of the flat direction ?*

The post inflationary running of the MSSM flat direction plays an important role. The flat direction starts oscillating at the SUSY breaking scale under the influence of potentials Eqs. (12) depending on whether SUSY is broken via gravity mediation or gauge mediation. For a negative values of $|K| < 0$, the leading potential term in gravity mediation case is $\sim |\phi|^{2-2K}$ shallower than the ϕ^2 . The oscillations in such a potential on average gives rise to a negative pressure which fragments the flat direction ⁴⁰. The linear fluctuations grow non-linearly and form non-topological solitons, known as B -balls. The B -balls carry baryon number $\sim 10^{17} - 10^{18}$ ^{36,37}, and release them via surface evaporation, which takes place usually after the electro-weak scale. For every baryon number there are 3 LSP (which is bino in the case of minimal SUGRA). Therefore MSSM flat direction is the only mechanism which can connect baryon number and cold dark matter abundance within an order of magnitude. It turns out that binos are over produced and therefore not hailed as a good candidate for CDM. However it opens the door for Higgsino and/or Wino to be the right candidate ⁴¹. The Q -balls are also formed in gauge mediation, though in this case mass per unit charge of a Q ball can be

less than the nucleon mass ⁴² (for numerical simulation see ⁴³). Therefore rendering such Q balls absolutely stable under surface evaporation. These Q -balls act as a potential candidate for CDM with $Q \geq 10^{12}$. Various indirect searches for dark matter experiment put constraints on the charge of stable Q balls, which is right now $Q \geq 10^{22}$ ⁴⁴.

The above mentioned applications exhibit how rich MSSM flat directions are for the early Universe cosmology. This is the most economical approach in obtaining a meaningful early Universe in conjunction with supersymmetry. In the remaining talk I will concentrate upon very new development on how MSSM flat directions can help generating scale invariant adiabatic density fluctuations.

7 Magic without Magic: generating adiabatic fluctuations

At the time of last scattering surface the perturbations in photons, baryons and CDM can be characterized by an overall curvature perturbation R , and a relative isocurvature component S in the different matter components

$$R = H \frac{\delta \rho}{\dot{\rho}}, \quad S = 3H \left(\frac{\delta \rho_\gamma}{\dot{\rho}} - \frac{\delta \rho_i}{\dot{\rho}_i} \right). \quad (13)$$

In a pure adiabatic case $S = 0$. But in general R and S could be correlated. An important point to realize that *entropy perturbations seed adiabatic perturbations on large scales*. This is the key for MSSM flat directions to succeed as a candidate for generating scale invariant fluctuations. The question arises if there are roughly 300 flat directions present during the inflationary epoch then what do they do?. As explained earlier inflaton sector need not take the burden of explaining the density fluctuations. There could be MSSM flat directions pioneering this role of generating perturbations. There are two popular schemes which I briefly sketch in this talk.

(1) *Curvaton scenario*:

Quantum fluctuations of the MSSM flat direction during inflation give rise to isocurvature perturbations. To comply with CMB measurements, these perturbations have to be converted into adiabatic ones ^{45,46,47}. Such a conversion takes place when the contribution of the curvaton energy density ρ_ϕ to the total energy density in the universe grows, i.e., with the increase of

$$r = \frac{3\rho_\phi}{4\rho_\gamma + 3\rho_\phi}. \quad (14)$$

Here ρ_γ is the energy in the radiation bath from inflaton decay (a hidden sector inflaton reheats into hidden sector relativistic degrees of freedom). Non-Gaussianity of the produced adiabatic perturbations requires the MSSM flat direction to contribute more than 1% to the energy density of the universe at the time of decay, that is $r_{\text{dec}} > 0.01$ ^{45,46,12}. Flat directions which are lifted

only by $d = 7, 9$ are appropriate for this scenario ³³ (see Eq. (9) for D -term inflation).

(2) *Fluctuating inflaton coupling:*

In a supersymmetric context the inflaton can decay into MSSM degrees of freedom via vev dependent couplings

$$W \ni \lambda_h I \bar{H} H + I \frac{q}{M} q q + I \frac{q_c}{M} q_c q_c + I \frac{h}{M} q q_c, \quad (15)$$

where I is the inflaton, H and $\bar{H}$ are the two Higgs doublets, and q and q_c are (s)quarks and (s)lepton superfields and their anti-particles. M is the cut-off scale. Fluctuations in $\delta\rho_\gamma/\rho_\gamma = -(2/3)\delta\Gamma/\Gamma$ ^{48,49,19}. The factor $2/3$ appears due to red-shift of the modes during the decay of the inflaton whose energy still dominates. The inflaton decay rate is $\Gamma = 1/(4\pi)m_I\lambda^2$. The decay rate fluctuates if either λ or m_I is a function of a fluctuating light field.

$$\lambda = \begin{cases} \lambda_0 \left(1 + \frac{\phi}{M} + \dots\right), & \text{direct decay.} \\ \lambda_0 \frac{\phi}{M}, & \text{indirect decay.} \end{cases} \quad (16)$$

In the MSSM example, the “direct” decay mode corresponds into inflaton decay into Higgs fields, whereas the “indirect” decay mode corresponds to decay into quarks and anti-squarks. The fluctuation in the decay rate for these cases is

$$\frac{\delta\Gamma}{\Gamma} = \begin{cases} 2 \frac{\delta\phi}{M}, & \text{direct decay.} \\ 2 \frac{\delta\phi}{\phi}, & \text{indirect decay.} \\ \frac{\delta\phi}{\phi}, & \text{fluctuating mass.} \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

Again fluctuations in MSSM flat direction generates isocurvature fluctuations which is then transferred to adiabatic fluctuations of the relativistic species at the time of reheating ^{48,50}.

8 Conclusion

MSSM along with SUGRA plays multi-faceted role in the early Universe. If SUSY is the answer for the desert between the electroweak and the Planck scale, then MSSM flat directions certainly provide an unique set up where questions ranging from density fluctuations to baryon asymmetry and cold dark matter generation can be addressed in a most economical way. This is a great triumph for SUSY and SUGRA that it can not only tame particle physics domain but can also conquer cosmology.

References

1. H. P. Nilles, Phys. Rept. **110**, 1 (1984).
2. K. Enqvist and A. Mazumdar, Phys. Rept. **380**, 3 (2003) [arXiv:hep-ph/0209244].

3. S. Deser, and B. Zumino, Phys. Rev. Lett. **38**, 1433 (1977).
4. P. Nath, R. Arnowitt, and A. Chamseddine, *Applied N=1 Supergravity*, Singapore (1984).
5. S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **48**, 1303 (1982).
6. J. Ellis, J. E. Kim, and D. V. Nanopoulos, Phys. Lett. B **145**, 181 (1984)
7. J. Ellis, D. V. Nanopoulos, and S. Sarkar, Phys. Lett. B **167**, 457 (1986).
8. S. Sarkar, Rep. Prog. Phys. **59**, 1493 (1996).
9. A. L. Maroto, and A. Mazumdar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 1655 (2000)
M. Bastero-Gil, and A. Mazumdar, Phys. Rev. D **62**, 083510 (2000) R.
Kallosh, L. Kofman, A. Linde, and A. Van Proyen, Phys. Rev. D **61**,
103503 (2000). R. Allahverdi, M. Bastero-Gil, and A. Mazumdar, Phys.
Rev. D **64**, 023516 (2001)
10. A. R. Frey and A. Mazumdar, Phys. Rev. D **67**, 046006 (2003) S. Kachru,
R. Kallosh, A. Linde and S. P. Trivedi, arXiv:hep-th/0301240.
11. E. J. Copeland, A. Mazumdar and N. J. Nunes, Phys. Rev. D **60**, 083506
(1999) A. R. Liddle, A. Mazumdar and F. E. Schunck, Phys. Rev. D **58**,
061301 (1998) A. Mazumdar, S. Panda and A. Perez-Lorenzana, Nucl.
Phys. B **614**, 101 (2001)
12. H. V. Peiris *et al.*, arXiv:astro-ph/0302225.
13. A. Mazumdar, Phys. Lett. B **469**, 55 (1999) A. Mazumdar, and A.
Pérez-Lorenzana, Phys. Lett. B **508**, 340 (2001).
14. V. A. Rubakov, and M. E. Shaposhnikov, Usp. Fiz. Nauk **166**, 5 (1996)
15. Review of Particle Physics, K. Hagiwara *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 010001
(2002).
16. M. Carena, J. M. Moreno, M. Quirós, M. Seco, and C. E. M. Wagner,
Nucl. Phys. B **599**, 158 (2001) M. Carena, M. Quirós, M. Seco, and C.
E. M. Wagner, arXiv:hep-ph/0208043.
17. W. Buchmüller, and M. Plümacher, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **15**, 5047 (2000)
18. R. Allahverdi and A. Mazumdar, Phys. Rev. D **67**, 023509 (2003) R. Al-
lahverdi, B. Dutta and A. Mazumdar, Phys. Rev. D **67**, 123515 (2003)
19. A. Mazumdar, arXiv:hep-ph/0306026.
20. J. R. Ellis, K. A. Olive, Y. Santoso and V. C. Spanos,
arXiv:hep-ph/0303043.
21. I. Affleck, and M. Dine, Nucl. Phys. B **249**, 361 (1985). M. Dine, L.
Randall, and S. Thomas, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 398 (1995)
22. M. Dine, L. Randall, and S. Thomas, Nucl. Phys. B **458**, 291 (1996)
23. P. Jaikumar and A. Mazumdar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 191301 (2003)
24. M. Grisaru, W. Siegel, and M. Rocek, Nucl. Phys. B **159**, 429 (1979);
N. Seiberg, Phys. Lett. B **318**, 469 (1993).
25. T. Gherghetta, C. Kolda, and S. P. Martin, Nucl. Phys. B **468**, 37 (1996)
26. F. Buccella, J. P. Derendinger, S. Ferrara, and C. A. Savoy, Phys. Lett.
B **115**, 375 (1982).
27. M. K. Gaillard, H. Murayama, and K. A. Olive, Phys. Lett. B **355**, 71
(1995)

28. J. Bagger, E. Poppitz, and L. Randall, Nucl. Phys. B **455**, 59 (1995).
29. P. Binetruy and G. R. Dvali, Phys. Lett. B **388**, 241 (1996)
30. C. Kolda, and J. March-Russell, Phys. Rev. D **60**, 023504 (1998)
31. A. B. Lahanas, and D. V. Nanopoulos, Phys. Rep. **145**, 1 (1987).
32. B. A. Campbell, M. K. Gaillard, H. Murayama, and K. A. Olive, Nucl. Phys. B **538**, 351 (1999).
33. K. Enqvist, S. Kasuya and A. Mazumdar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 091302 (2003) K. Enqvist, A. Jokinen, S. Kasuya and A. Mazumdar, arXiv:hep-ph/0303165. M. Postma, Phys. Rev. D **67**, 063518 (2003).
34. M. Fujii, K. Hamaguchi, and T. Yanagida, Phys. Rev. D **63**, 123513 (2001) M. Dine and A. Kusenko, arXiv:hep-ph/0303065.
35. R. Allahverdi, M. Drees and A. Mazumdar, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 065010 (2002) R. Allahverdi, A. Mazumdar and A. Ozipineci, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 125003 (2002)
36. K. Enqvist, and J. McDonald, Phys. Lett. B **425**, 309 (1998)
37. K. Enqvist, and J. McDonald, Nucl. Phys. B **538**, 321 (1999)
38. A. Kusenko, and M. E. Shaposhnikov, Phys. Lett. B **418**, 46 (1998) G. R. Dvali, A. Kusenko, and M. E. Shaposhnikov, Phys. Lett. B **417**, 99 (1998)
39. A. Jokinen, *Analytical and numerical properties of Affleck-Dine Condensate formation*. arXiv: hep-ph/0204086.
40. K. Enqvist, A. Jokinen, and J. McDonald, Phys. Lett. B **483**, 191 (2000) K. Enqvist, A. Jokinen, T. Multamäki, and I. Vilja, Phys. Rev. D **63**, 083501 (2001)
41. M. Fujii, and K. Hamaguchi, Phys. Lett. B **525**, 143 (2002). M. Fujii, and K. Hamaguchi, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 083501 (2002)
42. A. Kusenko, Phys. Lett. B **405**, 108 (1997) A. Kusenko, M. E. Shaposhnikov, P.G. Tinyakov, and I. I. Tkachev, Phys. Lett. B **423**, 104 (1998)
43. S. Kasuya and M. Kawasaki, Phys. Rev. D **62**, 023512 (2000) S. Kasuya and M. Kawasaki, Phys. Rev. D **61**, 041301 (2000)
44. J. Arafune, T. Yoshida, S. Nakamura, and K. Ogure, Phys. Rev. D **62**, 105013 (2000)
45. K. Enqvist and M. S. Sloth, Nucl. Phys. B **626**, 395 (2002)
46. D. H. Lyth and D. Wands, Phys. Lett. B **524**, 5 (2002).
47. M. Postma and A. Mazumdar, condensate,” arXiv:hep-ph/0304246.
48. G. Dvali, A. Gruzinov, and M. Zaldarriaga, astro-ph/0303591, L. Kofman, astro-ph/0303614.
49. K. Enqvist, A. Mazumdar and M. Postma, arXiv:astro-ph/0304187.
50. A. Mazumdar and M. Postma, arXiv:astro-ph/0306509.